

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed electronically or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date indicated below.

By: /Yvette L. Chriscaden/
Yvette L. Chriscaden

Date: March 13, 2007

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Before the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences

App. No. : 10/082,601 Confirmation No.: 5731
Inventor : Satoshi Nakajima
Filed : February 22, 2002
Title : AUTONOMOUS RENDERING OF EMAIL ATTACHMENTS
Art Unit : 2152
Examiner : Doan, Duyen My
Customer No. : 25,943

MAIL STOP: APPEAL BRIEF-PATENTS
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**APPELLANT'S BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF APPELLANT'S APPEAL TO THE BOARD
OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

Dear Sir:

This appeal furthers the Notice of Appeal filed on February 27, 2007. The appeal arises from a final decision by the Examiner in the final Office Action, dated November 2, 2006. The final decision was in response to a resubmitted appeal brief filed August 8, 2006.

Appellant respectfully requests consideration of this appeal by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for allowance of the present patent application.

Real Party in Interest:

This application is assigned UI Evolution, Inc., having a principal place of business at 11245 SE 6th St., Suite 110, Bellevue, Washington 98004 by virtue of an assignment recorded with the United States Patent and Trademark Office on February 22, 2002, at Reel 012643 Frame 0158.

Related Appeals and Interferences:

To the best of Appellant's knowledge, there are no related appeals or interference proceedings currently pending, which would directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this appeal.

Status of Claims:

Appellant appeals the rejection of claims 1-40. Claims 1-40 are reproduced, as pending, in Appendix A.

Status of Amendments:

Appellant has offered no amendments subsequent to the Examiner's final Office Action.

Summary of the Claimed Subject Matter:

Independent claim 1 is directed towards *a computer implemented method* that comprises

“processing by a computing device a binary file generated by a source application to identify one or more user interface displays rendered when contents of the binary file are viewed using the source application; and generating by the computing device a self-contained representation of the one or more user interface displays including one or more specifications correspondingly specifying the one or more user interface displays, to enable viewing of said contents of said binary file without usage of said source application, by rendering said one or more user interface displays in accordance with said one or more specifications.”

Element 104 of Figure 1 illustrates one example of an application, an email application 104 of an email sender 102, capable of performing the operations recited in claim 1. Element 104 of Figure 1 is described in detail on page 6, line 1 through page 7, line 9, in accordance with some embodiments. Figure 2 is a flowchart illustrating selected operations of the example email application performing the operations recited in claim 1. The operations illustrated by Figure 2 are described in greater detail on page 7, line 10 through page 9, line 17, in accordance with some embodiments. Figure 3 illustrates an example end user interface capable of facilitating the operations recited by claim 1. The end user interface illustrated by Figure 3 is described in greater detail on page 9, line 19 through page 10, line 13, in accordance with some embodiments. Figure 4 illustrates an operational flow for the user interface display generating aspect recited in claim 1. The operational flow illustrated by Figure 4 is described in greater detail on page 10, line 15, through page 11, line 22, in accordance with some embodiments.

Independent claim 7 is directed towards *a computer implemented method* that comprises

- “identifying by a computing device a format of a binary file generated by a source application;
- selecting by the computing device a set of user interface display specifications from a plurality of sets of user interface display specifications, based at least in part on the identified format of the binary file; and
- processing by the computing device the binary file to generate a self-contained representation of user interface displays of said binary file rendered when contents of the binary file are viewed using the source application, by associating results of said processing of the binary file with the selected set of user interface display specifications, to enable viewing of the user interface displays without the source application.”

Element 104 of Figure 1 illustrates one example of an application, an email application 104 of an email sender 102, capable of performing the operations recited in claim 7. Element 104 of Figure 1 is described in detail on page 6, line 1 through page 7, line 9, in

accordance with some embodiments. Figure 2 is a flowchart illustrating selected operations of the example email application performing the operations recited in claim 7. The operations illustrated by Figure 2 are described in greater detail on page 7, line 10 through page 9, line 17, in accordance with some embodiments. Figure 3 illustrates an example end user interface capable of facilitating the operations recited by claim 7. The end user interface illustrated by Figure 3 is described in greater detail on page 9, line 19 through page 10, line 13, in accordance with some embodiments. Figure 4 illustrates an operational flow for the user interface display generating aspect recited in claim 7. The operational flow illustrated by Figure 4 is described in greater detail on page 10, line 15, through page 11, line 22, in accordance with some embodiments.

Independent claim 15 is directed towards *a computer implemented method* of operation in an email recipient that comprises

- “receiving by a computing device an email message including an associated first attachment of a first attachment type;
- determining by the computing device whether said first attachment type is associated with a member of a group of one or more supported source applications;
- selecting by the computing device a set of one or more user interface display specifications from a plurality of sets of one or more user interface display specifications, based upon said first attachment type if it is determined said first attachment type is associated with a member of said group of one or more supported source applications;
- launching by the computing device a locally accessible version of the associated source application;
- simulating by the computing device one or more user input signals based upon said selected set of one or more user interface display specifications; and
- capturing by the computing device output responses of the associated source application to said one or more user input signals, and associating the captured output responses with the selected set of user interface display

specifications to generate a self-contained representation of said first attachment to allow subsequent viewing of the attachment without further use of the associated source application.”

Element 114 of Figure 1 illustrates one example of an application, an email application 114 of an email recipient 112, capable of performing the operations recited in claim 15. Element 114 of Figure 1 is described in detail on page 6, line 1 through page 7, line 9, in accordance with some embodiments. Figure 2 is a flowchart illustrating selected operations of the example email application performing the operations recited in claim 15. The operations illustrated by Figure 2 are described in greater detail on page 7, line 10 through page 9, line 17, in accordance with some embodiments.

Independent claim 21 is directed towards *an apparatus* that comprises

“a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions designed to
process a binary file generated by a source application to identify one or more user interface displays rendered when contents of the binary file are viewed using the source application,
generate a self-contained representation of the one or more user interface displays including one or more specifications correspondingly specifying the user interface displays, to enable viewing of said contents of said binary file, without usage of said source application, by rendering said one or more user interface displays in accordance with said one or more specifications; and
at least one processor coupled to the storage medium to execute the programming instructions.”

Element 102 of Figure 1 illustrates an email sender 102 having an email application 104 capable of serving as the apparatus of claim 21. Element 102 of Figure 1 is described in detail on page 6, line 1 through page 7, line 9, in accordance with some embodiments. Figure 2 is a flowchart illustrating selected operations that the apparatus of claim 21 may perform. The operations illustrated by Figure 2 are described in greater

detail on page 7, line 10 through page 9, line 17, in accordance with some embodiments. Figure 3 illustrates an example end user interface of the apparatus recited by claim 21. The end user interface illustrated by Figure 3 is described in greater detail on page 9, line 19 through page 10, line 13, in accordance with some embodiments. Figure 4 illustrates an operational flow for the user interface display generating aspect of the apparatus recited by claim 21. The operational flow illustrated by Figure 4 is described in greater detail on page 10, line 15, through page 11, line 22, in accordance with some embodiments. Figure 9 illustrates an apparatus capable of performing the operations of an email sender like the operations recited in claim 21, in accordance with some embodiments. The apparatus illustrated by Figure 9 is described in greater detail on page 15, line 21 through page 16, line 14, in accordance with some embodiments.

Independent claim 27 is directed towards *an apparatus* that comprises

“a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions designed to
identify a format of a binary file generated by a source application;
selecting a set of user interface display specifications from a plurality of
sets of user interface display specifications, based at least in part
on the identified format of the binary file, and
processing the binary file to generate a self-contained representation of
user interface displays of said binary file rendered when contents of
the binary file are viewed using the source application, by
associating results of said processing of the binary file with the
selected set of user interface display specifications ; and
at least one processor coupled to the storage medium to execute the
programming instructions.”

Element 102 of Figure 1 illustrates an email sender 102 having an email application 104 capable of serving as the apparatus of claim 27. Element 102 of Figure 1 is described in detail on page 6, line 1 through page 7, line 9, in accordance with some

embodiments. Figure 2 is a flowchart illustrating selected operations that the apparatus of claim 27 may perform. The operations illustrated by Figure 2 are described in greater detail on page 7, line 10 through page 9, line 17, in accordance with some embodiments. Figure 3 illustrates an example end user interface of the apparatus recited by claim 27. The end user interface illustrated by Figure 3 is described in greater detail on page 9, line 19 through page 10, line 13, in accordance with some embodiments. Figure 4 illustrates an operational flow for the user interface display generating aspect of the apparatus recited by claim 27. The operational flow illustrated by Figure 4 is described in greater detail on page 10, line 15, through page 11, line 22, in accordance with some embodiments. Figure 9 illustrates an apparatus capable of performing the operations of an email sender like the operations recited in claim 27, in accordance with some embodiments. The apparatus illustrated by Figure 9 is described in greater detail on page 15, line 21 through page 16, line 14, in accordance with some embodiments.

Independent claim 35 is directed towards *an apparatus* that comprises

“a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions designed to
receive an email message including an associated first attachment of a first attachment type,
determine whether said first attachment type is a member of a group of one or more supported source applications,
selecting a set of one or more specifications from a plurality of sets of one or more user interface display specifications, based upon said first attachment type if it is determined said first attachment type is associated with a member of said group of one or more supported source applications,
launch a locally accessible version of the associated source application,
simulate one or more user input signals based upon said selected set of one or more user interface display specifications, and

capture output responses of the associated source application to said one or more user input signals, and associate the captured output responses with the selected set of user interface display specifications to generate a self-contained representation of said first attachment to allow subsequent viewing of the attachment without further use of the associated source application; and at least one processor coupled to the storage medium to execute the programming instructions.”

Element 112 of Figure 1 illustrates an email recipient 112 having an email application 114 capable of serving as the apparatus of claim 35. Element 112 of Figure 1 is described in detail on page 6, line 1 through page 7, line 9, in accordance with some embodiments. Figure 2 is a flowchart illustrating selected operations that the apparatus of claim 35 may perform. The operations illustrated by Figure 2 are described in greater detail on page 7, line 10 through page 9, line 17, in accordance with some embodiments. Figure 9 illustrates an apparatus capable of performing the operations of an email sender like the operations recited in claim 35, in accordance with some embodiments. The apparatus illustrated by Figure 9 is described in greater detail on page 15, line 21 through page 16, line 14, in accordance with some embodiments.

Grounds For Rejection To Be Argued On Appeal:

- I. Claims 1, 7-11, 15-16, 18, 21, 27-31, 35-36, and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,839,741 issued to Tsai (“Tsai”).
- II. Claims 2-3, 6, 12-14, 19-20, 22-23, 26, 32-34, and 39-40 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsai in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,178,432 to Cook et al. (“Cook”).
- III. Claims 4-5, 17, 24-25, and 37 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsai in view of what was well known in the art at the time of the invention.

Arguments:

- I. Rejections of claims 1, 7-11, 15-16, 18, 21, 27-31, 35-36, and 38 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) were improper because all elements of those claims are not explicitly taught by, or inherent in, Tsai.

To establish lack of novelty under §102(e), each and every element of the claimed invention must be expressly or inherently discussed in the prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). For something to be inherent in the prior art the “extrinsic evidence must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference, and that it would be recognized by persons of ordinary skill. Inherency, however, may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient.” In Re Robertson, 169 F.3d 743 (Fed Cir 1999) (see also MPEP 2112).

Claim 1 recites a method comprising:

“processing by a computing device a binary file generated by a source application to identify one or more user interface displays rendered when contents of the binary file are viewed using the source application;

and
generating by the computing device a self-contained representation of the one or more user interface displays including one or more specifications correspondingly specifying the one or more user interface displays, to enable viewing of said contents of said binary file without usage of said source application, by rendering said one or more user interface displays in accordance with said one or more specifications.”

Thus, the method of claim 1 advantageously generates a self-contained representation of a binary file’s identified user interface displays rendered using the binary file’s source application. The self-contained representation may be viewed without accessing the source application.

In the above captioned office action, Examiner cites Tsai column 3, lines 25-67, column 4 line 61 through column 5 line 8, column 5 lines 26-44, and column 6 lines 36-40 for the proposition that Tsai discloses identifying “one or more user interface displays

rendered when contents of the binary file are viewed using the source application” and generates “a self-contained representation of the one or more user interface displays”. Also, Examiner asserts that the “specification” of claim 1 is inherent in Tsai “to enable the user browser to display the attachment file.”

Tsai discloses a method of storing email attachments in a centrally-accessible web server so that they may be removed from incoming emails and replaced with a notification to access the attachment via the server. The attachment can then be viewed directly by downloading the attachment and launching the source application. Alternatively, it may be viewed in a “web-friendly format, such as HTML format” (see column 4, lines 64-66 and column 5, lines 26-33). Tsai discusses a “converter” for converting attachments such as, for example, a built-in converter found in Microsoft Word (see column 6, lines 36-40). Applicant assumes, *arguendo*, that the HTML conversion of Tsai creates a “self-contained representation” of the attachment. However, there is no disclosure as to the process used to accomplish the conversion. In particular, there is no disclosure that the conversion identifies “one or more user interface displays rendered when contents of the binary file are viewed using the source application” as required by claim 1. Thus, Tsai fails to disclose at least this element of claim 1.

Additionally, Applicant submits that such is not inherent in the disclosure of Tsai. Creating an HTML version allows users of the Tsai system to view the document using a browser to decide whether to download the original (see column 5, lines 36-44). To accomplish this, it would not be necessary to display “one or more user interface displays rendered when contents of the binary file are viewed using the source application”. In fact, it is quite possible that Tsai’s HTML conversion could generate a document not visually identical to the original but which merely gives the user a “gist” of the document. For example, formatting, graphical display resolution, and other aspects of the document may be altered during conversion to ease viewing with a web browser without detracting from the purpose of Tsai. Thus, while it is possible that the HTML conversion of Tsai creates specifications that correspond to user interface displays as they would appear when rendered by the source application, this mere possibility alone

is insufficient for such to be inherent in the prior art. Therefore, applicant submits that at least this limitation of claim 1 is not inherent in Tsai.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, applicant submits that Tsai neither teaches nor suggests each and every element of claim 1 and that claim 1 is therefore patentable over Tsai. Thus, applicant respectfully requests that claim 1 be allowed.

Each of independent claims 7, 15, 21, 27, and 35 contain in substance the same recitations earlier discussed for claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, claims 7, 15, 21, 27, and 35 are patentable over Tsai.

Claims 8-11, 16, 18, 28-31, 36, and 38 depend from claims 7, 15, 21, 27, and 35 respectively. Thus, for at least the same reasons, claims 8-11, 16, 18, 28-31, 36, and 38 are patentable over Tsai.

- II. The rejection of claims 2-3, 6, 12-14, 19-20, 22-23, 26, 32-34, and 39-40 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) was improper because Tsai, alone or in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,178,432 issued to Cook et al. ("Cook"), fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention when the invention as claimed in claims 2-3, 6, 12-14, 19-20, 22-23, 26, 32-34, and 39-40 is viewed as a whole.

To establish obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the Examiner must view the invention as a whole. Further, the Examiner is to perform the obviousness analysis in accordance with the standard set forth by the Supreme Court in *Graham v. John Deere Co.* That standard requires that the Examiner (1) determine the scope and content of the prior art; (2) ascertain the differences between the prior art and the claims in issue; (3) resolve the level of ordinary skill in the art; and (4) evaluate evidence of secondary considerations. 383 U.S. 1, 17-18 (1966); see also MPEP 2141. Secondary considerations include whether the invention met with commercial success, whether the invention answered a long felt need, and whether others attempting the invention have

failed. *Graham*, 383 U.S. at 17-18. In applying the *Graham* framework, the Examiner must consider the invention as a whole, without the benefit of hindsight. MPEP 2141.

As a procedural matter, the Examiner bears the initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. To do so, three criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation to combine or modify the reference teachings to achieve the claimed invention. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, all elements of the claimed invention must be taught or suggested by the reference teachings. Once a *prima facie* case has been established, the Applicant bears the burden of coming forward with evidence of nonobviousness. MPEP 2142.

As argued above, Tsai fails to disclose, expressly or inherently, the required elements of the present invention, as claimed in claims 1, 7, 15, 21, and 35 and from which claims 2-3, 6, 12-14, 19-20, 22-23, 26, 32-34, and 39-40 depend. Additionally, Cook does not remedy the deficiencies of Tsai. Cook discloses a method for creating an interactive web page with hidden elements that may be displayed when the user takes some pre-determined action. It does not disclose or suggest identifying “one or more user interface displays rendered when contents of the binary file are viewed using the source application” or “generating by the computing device a self-contained representation of the one or more user interface displays” as required by claims 2-3, 6, 12-14, 19-20, 22-23, 26, 32-34, and 39-40. Thus, not all elements of the claimed invention are taught by the combined teachings of Tsai and Cook.

Additionally, Applicant submits that there would have been no suggestion or motivation to modify the teachings of Tsai to achieve the invention of claims 2-3, 6, 12-14, 19-20, 22-23, 26, 32-34, and 39-40. As discussed above, the purpose of Tsai is to make email attachments, and HTML versions of those attachments, available on a web-server. Therefore, the focus of Tsai is not on the HTML conversion process itself, but rather on the storage and retrieval of the HTML-converted attachments. The particular HTML conversion methods used are merely ancillary. In fact, Tsai discloses using, in some instances, built-in HTML converters. No limitations or drawbacks to existing conversion techniques are identified. There is no teaching that existing techniques were in any way insufficient to achieve the intended purpose. Seemingly, any

conversion methodology would do. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized no advantage in improving upon or modifying the existing conversion methods. Thus, one of ordinary skill would have found no suggestion to modify the HTML conversion methods discussed in Tsai to achieve the invention of claims 2-3, 6, 12-14, 19-20, 22-23, 26, 32-34, and 39-40.

Consequently, for at least these reasons, Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case for the obviousness of claims 2-3, 6, 12-14, 19-20, 22-23, 26, 32-34, and 39-40 viewed as a whole. Thus, these claims are patentable over Tsai alone or in combination with Cook.

- III. The rejection of Claims 4-5, 17, 24-25, and 37 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsai in view of what was well known in the art at the time of the invention was improper because Tsai in view of what was well known in the art at the time of the invention, fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention when the invention as claimed in claims 4-5, 17, 24-25, and 37 is viewed as a whole.

As stated above, Tsai fails to disclose, expressly or inherently, the required elements of the present invention claimed in claims 1, 15, 21, and 35 from which claims 4-5, 17, 24-25, and 37 depend. Additionally, what was well known in the art does not remedy the above discussed deficiencies of Tsai. Further, for the same reasons discussed above, there would have been no motivation to modify Tsai to achieve the invention of claims 4-5, 17, 24-25, and 37. Thus, Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Consequently, claims 4-5, 17, 24-25, and 37 viewed as a whole are patentable over the combination of Tsai and what was well known in the art.

Conclusion

Appellant respectfully submits that all the appealed claims in this application are patentable and requests that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences overrule the Examiner and direct allowance of the rejected claims.

The fees associated with the appeal brief were submitted with the original appeal brief. We do not believe any additional fees, in particular extension of time fees, are needed. However, should that be necessary, please charge our deposit account 500393. In addition, please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 13, 2007

/Richard B. Leggett/
Richard B. Leggett, Reg. No. 59,485
Agent for Appellant Applicant

Schwabe Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.
1420 Fifth, Suite 3010
Seattle, WA 98101
Tel: (206) 622-1542
Fax: (206) 292-0460

Appendix A – Appealed Claims

1. (Previously Presented) A computer implemented method comprising:
processing by a computing device a binary file generated by a source application to identify one or more user interface displays rendered when contents of the binary file are viewed using the source application; and
generating by the computing device a self-contained representation of the one or more user interface displays including one or more specifications correspondingly specifying the one or more user interface displays, to enable viewing of said contents of said binary file without usage of said source application, by rendering said one or more user interface displays in accordance with said one or more specifications.
2. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1, wherein each specification includes one or more transition rules specifying one or more transitions to one or more other user interface displays specified by one or more other specifications.
3. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 2, wherein each transition rule specifies transition to another user interface display specified by another specification when the user interface displays enter a particular user interface display state.
4. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1, further comprising:
encoding by the computing device an electronic message having said self-contained representation attached, using a MIME protocol, a Uuencode protocol, or a BinHex protocol; and
transmitting by the computing device said encoded electronic message and self-contained representation to one or more addressed recipients.
5. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 4, further comprising attaching by said computing device said self-contained representation to the electronic message.

6. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1, wherein each of said user interface displays comprises one or more display cells, and each of said specification comprises one or more display cell specifications correspondingly specifying the one or more display cells.
7. (Previously Presented) A computer implemented method comprising:
identifying by a computing device a format of a binary file generated by a source application;
selecting by the computing device a set of user interface display specifications from a plurality of sets of user interface display specifications, based at least in part on the identified format of the binary file; and
processing by the computing device the binary file to generate a self-contained representation of user interface displays of said binary file rendered when contents of the binary file are viewed using the source application, by associating results of said processing of the binary file with the selected set of user interface display specifications, to enable viewing of the user interface displays without the source application.
8. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 7, further comprising:
attaching by the computing device said self-contained representation with an electronic message; and
transmitting by the computing device said electronic message and said attached self-contained representation to one or more recipients for viewing, where the viewing includes rendering said user interface displays in accordance with said user interface display specifications and user input(s).
9. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 7, wherein said binary file is either a word processing document or a spreadsheet document.
10. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 7, wherein said determining is based upon a filename extension associated with said binary file.

11. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 7, wherein said processing further comprises:

launching by the computing device a locally accessible version of the application;

simulating by the computing device user input(s) to said application based at least in part upon said selected set of user interface display specifications; and

storing by the computing device output(s) from said application in response to said user input(s).

12. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 7, wherein each specification includes one or more transition rules specifying one or more transitions to one or more other user interface displays specified by one or more other specifications.

13. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 12, wherein each transition rule specifies transition to another user interface display specified by another specification when the user interface displays enter a particular user interface display state.

14. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 7, wherein each of said user interface displays comprises one or more display cells, and each of said specification comprises one or more display cell specifications correspondingly specifying the one or more display cells.

15. (Previously Presented) A computer implemented method comprising:
receiving by a computing device an email message including an associated first attachment of a first attachment type;

determining by the computing device whether said first attachment type is associated with a member of a group of one or more supported source applications;

selecting by the computing device a set of one or more user interface display specifications from a plurality of sets of one or more user interface display specifications, based upon said first attachment type if it is determined said first

attachment type is associated with a member of said group of one or more supported source applications;

launching by the computing device a locally accessible version of the associated source application;

simulating by the computing device one or more user input signals based upon said selected set of one or more user interface display specifications; and

capturing by the computing device output responses of the associated source application to said one or more user input signals, and associating the captured output responses with the selected set of user interface display specifications to generate a self-contained representation of said first attachment to allow subsequent viewing of the attachment without further use of the associated source application.

16. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 15, further comprising:

associating by the computing device said representation with said email message in the form a second attachment, replacing said first attachment;

encoding by the computing device said email message and said second attachment; and

transmitting said encoded email message and second attachment to a designated recipient.

17. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 16, wherein said encoding comprises encoding the representation in accordance with the MIME protocol.

18. (Original) The method of claim 15, wherein said first attachment type comprises a proprietary format.

19. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 15, wherein each of said plurality of user interface displays comprises one or more display cells, and each of said user interface display specifications comprises one or more display cell specifications.

20. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 19, wherein each of said specifications further comprises one or more transition rules, each transition rule specifying a transition to a user interface display when the user interface displays enter a particular display state.

21. (Previously Presented) An apparatus comprising:
a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions designed to

process a binary file generated by a source application to identify one or more user interface displays rendered when contents of the binary file are viewed using the source application,

generate a self-contained representation of the one or more user interface displays including one or more specifications correspondingly specifying the user interface displays, to enable viewing of said contents of said binary file, without usage of said source application, by rendering said one or more user interface displays in accordance with said one or more specifications; and

at least one processor coupled to the storage medium to execute the programming instructions.

22. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 21, wherein each specification includes one or more transition rules specifying one or more transitions to one or more other user interface displays specified by one or more other specifications.

23. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 22, wherein each transition rule specifies transition to another user interface display specified by another specification when the user interface displays enter a particular user interface display states.

24. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 21, wherein the programming instructions are further designed to encode an electronic message having said self-

contained representation attached, using either a MIME protocol, a Uuencode protocol, or a BinHex protocol.

25. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 21, wherein the programming instructions are further adapted to attach said self-contained representation to the electronic message.

26. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 21, wherein each of said user interface displays comprises one or more display cells, and each of said specification comprises one or more display cell specifications correspondingly specifying the one or more display cells.

27. (Previously Presented) An apparatus comprising:
a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions designed to
 identify a format of a binary file generated by a source application;
 selecting a set of user interface display specifications from a plurality of sets of user interface display specifications, based at least in part on the identified format of the binary file, and
 processing the binary file to generate a self-contained representation of user interface displays of said binary file rendered when contents of the binary file are viewed using the source application, by associating results of said processing of the binary file with the selected set of user interface display specifications ; and
at least one processor coupled to the storage medium to execute the programming instructions.

28. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 27, wherein the programming instructions are further designed to
attach said self-contained representation with an electronic message; and

transmit said electronic message and said attached self-contained representation to one or more recipients for viewing, where the viewing includes rendering said user interface displays in accordance with said user interface display specifications and user inputs.

29. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 27, wherein said binary file is either a word processing document or a spreadsheet document.

30. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 27, wherein said programming instructions are adapted to perform said determining based upon a filename extension associated with said binary file.

31. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 27, wherein the programming instructions are further designed to

launch a locally accessible version of the application;

simulate user input(s) to said application based at least in part upon said selected set of user interface display specifications; and

store output(s) from said application in response to said user input(s).

32. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 27, wherein each specification includes one or more transition rules specifying one or more transitions to one or more other user interface displays specified by one or more other specifications.

33. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 32, wherein each transition rule specifies transition to another user interface display specified by another specification when the user interface displays enter a particular user interface display states.

34. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 27, wherein each of said user interface displays comprises one or more display cells, and each of said specification comprises one or more display cell specifications correspondingly specifying the one or more display cells.

35. (Previously Presented) An apparatus comprising:
a storage medium having stored therein a plurality of programming instructions designed to
receive an email message including an associated first attachment of a first attachment type,
determine whether said first attachment type is a member of a group of one or more supported source applications,
selecting a set of one or more specifications from a plurality of sets of one or more user interface display specifications, based upon said first attachment type if it is determined said first attachment type is associated with a member of said group of one or more supported source applications,
launch a locally accessible version of the associated source application,
simulate one or more user input signals based upon said selected set of one or more user interface display specifications, and
capture output responses of the associated source application to said one or more user input signals, and associate the captured output responses with the selected set of user interface display specifications to generate a self-contained representation of said first attachment to allow subsequent viewing of the attachment without further use of the associated source application; and
at least one processor coupled to the storage medium to execute the programming instructions.

36. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 35, wherein the programming instructions are further designed to
associate said representation with said email message in the form a second attachment replacing said first attachment;
encode said email message and said second attachment; and
transmit said email message and said second attachment to a designated recipient.

37. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 36, wherein said encoding comprises encoding the representation in accordance with the MIME protocol.

38. (Original) The apparatus of claim 35, wherein said first attachment type comprises a proprietary format.

39. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 35, wherein each of said plurality of user interface displays further comprises one or more display cells, and each of said user interface display specifications comprises one or more display cell specifications.

40. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 39, wherein each of said specifications further comprises one or more transition rules, each transition rule specifying a transition to a user interface display when the user interface displays enter a particular display state.

Appendix B – Copies of Evidence Submitted

No evidence has been submitted under 37 C.F.R. 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132. No evidence entered by Examiner has been relied upon by Appellant in the appeal.

Appendix C – Related Proceedings

None. There are no related appeals or interference proceedings currently pending, which would directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this appeal.